Why Nixon Picked Connally, P. 2; Hoover and the Berrigans, P. 3

Speaking of International Outlaws

He (Capt. Edward Medina, the company commander) ordered the village burned, the animals shot, the wells contaminated and every living thing in that area killed.

—George W. Latimer, Lt. Wm. L. Calley's chief defense counsel, in his opening statement Dec. 10, the same day Nixon at press conference called North Vietnam "an international outlaw."

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 24 DECEMBER 28, 1970 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Nixon's Secret New Obstacle to A Prisoner Exchange

In the negotiations to end the Korean conflict, the prisoner of war issue delayed a settlement by 18 months. During that time the United Nations Command suffered an additional 140,000 casualties, including nearly 9,000 more Americans killed. The delay and the additional casualties were due to a prolonged but little publicized campaign of "re-education" in the POW camps. This was designed to bring about mass defections. Chinese and North Korean soldiers were offered asylum and other inducements if they turned anti-Communist. When truce talks began the U.S. then insisted that prisoners be given freedom of choice to return home or remain on our side. The stage is being set for a replay of that long and costly wrangle by an unnoticed phrase in Nixon's Oct. 7 speech offering a 5-point plan to end the war. "I propose," Nixon then said, "all prisoners of war, without exception, without condition, be released now *to return to the place of their choice.*" (Our italics.) It is typical of Nixon's tricky tactics that a sentence which began by speaking of no exceptions or conditions should end by covertly setting the same condition that proved so costly in the Korean negotiations. The "place of their choice" is the Korean war principle of "voluntary repatriation" rephrased. It means that instead of simply exchanging all prisoners on both sides, we enter into another long wrangle over who wants to go home. The purpose then was to impose a cold war political defeat on the other side, and (for those who still wanted a military victory in Korea) to delay a peaceful settlement in the hope that the war could be re-escalated.

No Right To Know?

The Korean war began on June 25, 1950; the truce negotiators first met a year later on July 10, 1951. The talks seemed to have reached their end when the prisoner of war argument began on Dec. 11, 1951. The talks did not end until July 27, 1953 when the armistice was finally signed after the longest truce talks in history. The casualty total was 305,000 when the truce talks began. It was 445,000 before the POW issue was resolved. A simple exchange of all prisoners on both sides "without exception" and "without condition"—to use Nixon's words—would have brought U.S. POWs home 18 months earlier last time. Their suffering and that of their families was prolonged to pay for a propaganda victory. It enabled Chiang Kai-shek to impose loss of face on Peking—and Syngman Rhee a similar defeat on Norh Korea. Most of the Chinese "volunteers" and the North Korean soldiers elected not to go home. To suggest a "place of their choice" release again is to prepare the ground for a repetition of all this agony. Surely the country and POW families have a right to know what is being planned and to make their views known before so crucial a policy decision is made.

Clifford on Nixon's Back-to-Bombing Policy

The policy that he [Nixon] enunciated last night is a complete departure from any understanding that was had between the parties. This is a new element that he has added to it. I think it is really a distressing change. I might say that if there is any one lesson that I've learned, maybe with 5 years of experience about Vietnam, it is that the application of military force—in this instance, the increased application of military force—will not bring peace in Vietnam. That's why I think this policy could turn out to have tragic results.

We've been all through the bombing of Vietnam. We started in 1965, and in '66 and '67 and '68 we bombed North Vietnam. It was not effective then, and it will not prove to be effective now. It did not bring peace then, and I assure you it will not bring peace now. I tell you what the bombing will do, if he starts it again. It will mean more war, and more destruction, and more fighting, and more dying.

—Former Defense Secretary Clifford: CBS Dec. 11.

It is characteristic of this Administration and of the military bureaucracy that at the very time they are running a campaign to exploit the POW issue they should secretly be preparing negotiating positions that can only prolong POW suffering. Nothing could better demonstrate the cynicism behind the campaign. For months the appeals of POW wives and mothers were treated coldly or ignored until the Pentagon and the White House decided this was a useful way to build up the hate required if they found it necessary again to escalate the war *as they have begun to do.* But when talks reach the POW issue again we will find the appeal to bring our POWs home muted and a new propaganda campaign begun to guarantee the POWs we hold the right "to return to the place of their choice." This is the trap which lies ahead.

In the Korean war the South Korean regime, like the Saigon regime, balked at peace talks altogether because it wanted the U.S. to go on and reunite Korea by force, though China demonstrated that she would not allow this and had pushed our troops back to the 38th parallel, the old dividing line, with terrible losses on both sides. The South Korean regime and those U.S. military who, like MacArthur saw "no substitute for victory," seized on the POW issue to prolong the fighting in the hope that the peace talks would break down altogether, and full scale war could be renewed. Any resemblance between the situation then and the situation now is not coincidental.

A debate on this question should begin now and not when the country finds itself before another costly fait accompli. Two

(Continued On Page 4)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nixon Picks An LBJ Man As He Shifts to LBJ's War and Inflation Course

After Deficit Financing, Can Arms Race and More War Be Far Behind?

NIXON'S SPEECH TO THE NAM marked his conversion almost 40 years later to Keynesianism: deficit financing New Deal style as a means of stimulating business recovery. Unfortunately John Kenneth Galbraith's recent Fabian Society lecture shows (see text in the London *New Statesman* Dec. 4) it is too late for Keynesianism. Big Business and Big Labor have made it obsolete. Only wage and price controls, Galbraith argues, can combine "adequate employment with reasonable price stability." But though labor leadership is ready for this, it is too big a pill for the G.O.P. to swallow.

The basic undertow will carry Nixon from deficit financing toward resumed arms race and more war. This is the historic Democratic way out, the profitable way to combat unemployment. Joblessness is now back to the 1963 level when the involvement in Vietnam began to mount. *As the war began to ebb, unemployment began to rise.* These are the objective factors which make return to tension and tough policies seductive. But it is too soon after the last inflationary binge to start a new one, and the road leads to disaster.

Just Gambling On More Inflation

RESUMED BOMBING OF THE NORTH will reactivate the peace movement here and the war spirit there. And it will further undermine the confidence of the business community. As it is, business loans have not responded to cheap money. All it has done is to set off a stock market boomlet which Nixon wants for his election campaign. But there is no substance behind it; it is just gambling on more inflation.

THE REPLACEMENT OF KENNEDY BY CONNALLY symbolizes Nixon's shift toward deficit financing. It also reflects his preference for yes-men in the Cabinet; just as Hickel was too independent-minded on his left, the Chicago banker, Kennedy, has been too outspoken on Nixon's right. Only a few weeks ago, Kennedy toured Western Europe to assure officials there that the U.S. was working to strengthen the dollar and to curb inflation at home. He must have been surprised to return and find Nixon encouraging inflationary speculation at home while risking a deterioration in the balance of payments by re-escalating the war.

CONNALLY IS DESCRIBED by Texans who know him well as a "stuffed shirt" with no qualifications for the Treasury post other than his self-assurance. The appointment is seen by them as a move to "sew up oil money" for Nixon in 1972. The deeper significance lies in Connally's lifelong association with Lyndon Johnson. As Nixon turns back to Johnson's bombing-and-inflation policies, he can use a Johnson man in the Cabinet as a bi-partisan front for escalated war. *Connally led the fight against a peace plank at the 1968 Democratic convention.*

GEORGE BUSH, TO REPLACE Yost at the UN, is better qualified for the Treasury; he was on the Ways and Means Committee in the House. But he does not have Connally's political advantages. Bush is completely unqualified for the UN job; it's just a reward for a defeated Republican. We regret Charles Yost's removal; his knowledge and impartial sympathies on the Middle East made him ideal for the UN post as the Jarring talks resume. He symbolized the "even-handed" policy and the effort at reconciliation, and his going may reflect pressure from the Zionist movement.

IF THE BASQUE TRIALS set off an explosion in Spain, will U.S. forces be used to support Franco? Will Europe's last surviving Fascist dictator, whose forces fought on the other side in World War II, be defended by U.S. troops and planes? Lawrence Fernsworth, who covered the Spanish Civil War for the London *Times*, spelled out the evidence of secret American commitments to Franco in *The Nation* last November 16. The time to prevent intervention is now.

Do They Keep Dossiers on Senators, Too?

FULBRIGHT: There have been two stories recently, one in the *Washington Star* Dec. 9 by Frank Getlein and another by Carl Rowan on the military intelligence apparatus activities as to civilians, including members of Congress. The first says, "The big news so far in December certainly has been the revelations on NBC's First Tuesday that various branches of military intelligence have been involved in investigating American citizens not in the least subject to legitimate military authority (including) candidates for the Presidency and the widow of Martin Luther King" and the other one says, "At Fort Holabird the Army was keeping a computerized master file of dissenters, protesters, and others suspected of being less than 100% loyal to what the military agents regard as the American way of life." I wonder, in view of that, if I should happen to vote against this appropriation (for Cambodia) would that be added to my dossier? [Laughter].

LAIRD: Well, I would question that, Mr. Chairman . . .

FULBRIGHT: Can you say categorically whether they do have dossiers on members of the Senate . . .

LAIRD: I would not think so . . .

FULBRIGHT: Would you let me see the dossier if they have one.

LAIRD: I would be pleased to. [Laughter].

—Before Senate Foreign Relations Dec. 11

Senator McCarthy Exposes Two Steps Backward In The Nixon Welfare Plan

The family assistance plan has been widely praised for providing a minimum income floor—$1,600, which is really a subbasic level. Few people realize that it also sets forth a maximum benefit ceiling for Federal matching purposes. This is more significant and really more effective. Benefits would be cut off at a level determined by reference to the poverty level stated in the bill; thus, families are effectively prohibited from receiving payments in an amount above the poverty level. Two States, New York and New Jersey, already pay benefits at a level above the poverty line. By establishing a ceiling, the administration plan would reduce benefits for over 1,450,000 persons in these two States alone. Moveover, it would effectively prohibit other States from any future increases in benefits above the poverty line.

The forced-work program is a major feature. In fact, the program was referred to in the recent campaign as 'not a welfare program but a work-fare program.' Today, when an employer is not covered by minimum wage laws, he is forced by the market to pay a subsistence wage. If he pays less, it is difficult for him to get anyone to work for him. But under the administration plan, he could offer as low a wage as he wanted and still be assured a continual supply of cheap labor. He need only inform the local welfare office that jobs are available; the poor must then work for him no matter what he pays or lose their benefits. This, it seems to me, encourages practices which even the free market by itself would not allow. It is a modern version of the debtor's prison—without walls.

—Sen. McCarthy (D. Minn.) in the Senate, Dec. 2, summarizing his hearings on the Nixon welfare bill.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Does The No. 1 G-Man Carry On A Posthumous Slander Campaign Against King?

Hoover's Preposterous Charges Against The Berrigan Brothers

If it was anybody else but J. Edgar Hoover, he'd be put down as a first class idiot for his attack on the jailed brothers Berrigan. If they are indeed head of a bomb ring planning to disrupt Washington and kidnap a high official in order to stop the war, he disrupted a valuable intelligence operation by talking about it in public and thus warning the plotters to cover their tracks. Secondly, if there is such a plot (and our prison system is so poor that these two priests can direct such a far flung operation from inside Danbury) and they should be brought to court for this criminal conspiracy, the prosecution has been put in jeopardy by Hoover's babbling. They can claim a mistrial on the ground that his conviction of them in the headlines before they were even indicted had destroyed any possibility of a fair trial. Nixon was evasive when asked about Hoover's charges. Nixon said the Justice Department was studying Hoover's testimony "and will take appropriate action." The truth, of course, is that both the charges and Hoover's conduct are preposterous by any rational standard.

Hoover's Sick Obsession With King

A more serious issue was raised by the second part of that same question, which Nixon also dodged. This concerned the *Time* (Dec. 14) interview in which Hoover again called the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King "a liar." At a time of deep racial tension, it is a positive menace to national security in a real sense of that term to have the head of the FBI continue a campaign of posthumous character assassination against the greatest black American of our time and the first American black to win the Nobel peace prize—"he was the last one in the world who should ever have received it," Hoover said to *Time*.

Hoover has some kind of sick obsession with King. He keeps hitting at him, like a frenzied lyncher kicking a corpse. Add the King campaign to his renewed attack in *Time* on Bobby Kennedy (for suggesting more black FBI men!) and his slurs on Puerto Ricans and Chicanos (also in *Time*) and the racial prejudice is unmistakable.

Hoover's attack on the Berrigans is beginning to make a dove of Rep. Wm. R. Anderson *(D. Tenn)*. His counter-attack on Hoover in the House Dec. 9 should be circulated by the peace movement. Anderson represents a rural district west of Nashville. He is an Annapolis graduate who won a Bronze Star in combat in the Pacific in World War II and commanded the nuclear submarine *Nautilus* in its historic voyage under the North Pole. Anderson not only defended the Berrigans, as he had already done in several newspaper interviews, but protested their harassment in prison*, suggested that Hoover was insensitive to the deeper causes of crime, and for the first time began to question the war itself. Four Congressmen, including Wm. F. Ryan *(D)* and Ogden R. Reid *(R)* of New York rose to support Anderson.

The FBI May Not Draw Conclusions But J. Edgar Certainly Does

Mr. (Frank T.) BOW (R. Ohio): How did this so-called leak get out with regard to Kent State?

Mr. (J. Edgar) HOOVER: That did not come from the FBI. But it did cause me great concern. The first time I knew of it was when the Akron Beacon-Journal had a great headline—it is part of the Knight chain of newspapers—saying "FBI: No Reason For Guard To Shoot at Kent State." I knew this was untrue. We never make any conclusions . . . There were certainly extenuating circumstances which caused the guard to resort to the use of firearms. Perhaps they were not as completely trained as they should have been, but certainly some stated they feared for their lives and then fired; some of the students were throwing bricks and rocks and taunting the National Guardsmen.

Mr. BOW: Do you mind this being on the record?

Mr. Hoover: Not at all.

—pp. 609-10. House Appropriations hearings on the 1971 supplemental, released Dec. 8.

*** He protested the use of leg shackles in moving the Rev. Daniel Berrigan. "The last time I saw leg shackles," he told the House, "was in Con Son Island prison camp, in the tiger cages of the South Vietnamese government." Rep. Anderson exposed Con Son last summer.**

From Speeches In The House Criticizing Hoover's Attacks On The Berrigans And Others

As a lifelong admirer of Mr. Hoover and the FBI, I am convinced that he would not purposely subvert the Constitution or undermine our democratic processes. Yet it is manifest that on Friday, Nov. 27 he did so . . . Mr. Hoover testified that Fathers Philip and Daniel Berrigan are "the prinicpal leaders of a conspiracy planning to blow up underground electrical conduits and steam pipes serving the Washington, D.C. area." Mr. Hoover went on to add, "The plotters are also concocting a scheme to kidnap a highly placed government official . . . If successful, the plotters would demand an end to the U.S. bombing operations in Southeast Asia and the release of all political prisoners.

Knowing the Berrigan brothers . . . I find it impossible to believe that Mr. Hoover's allegations are true. Even in destroying draft files, illegal acts which they committed to dramatize the death toll of young American boys in Vietnam, they were meticulously careful to plan the events so that no physical harm could possibly befall clerks, bystanders, police or anyone else . . . If his [Hoover's] actions stem from such a degree of rage or fear that his purpose is to discredit all who peaceably and without violence oppose the Vietnam war, then I must again conclude with much sadness that he, too, is a victim of that war.

—Rep. Wm. R. Anderson (D. Tenn) in the House Dec. 9

Mr. (Abner J.) Mikva (D. Ill): The unsupportable testimony Mr. Hoover has given the committee is yet another bit of evidence that the FBI has become in itself a center of political action within the U.S. generating a force from the "right" that has the potential of becoming as destructive as it is divisive.

Mr. (Don) Edwards (D. Cal): I was a special agent of the FBI in the years 1940 and 1941 . . . Punishment of Americans by accusation of crime by a high government department official such as the Director of the FBI is an unconstitutional and improper action . . . The U.S. with its immense size, its varied ethnic groups, . . . is a complicated difficult country to govern. High Federal officials should set an example of responsible dialogue free from invective . . . It is certainly not appropriate . . . for Mr. Hoover to say as reported in this week's Time Magazine, "You never have to bother about a President being shot by Puerto Ricans or Mexicans. They don't shoot very straight. But if they come at you with a knife, beware." . . . (nor) to brand Nobel Peace Prize Winner Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. "a liar."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Much Free Choice In The Free Choice Last Time

(Continued From Page 1)

issues are entangled here. One is the right of anti-Communist prisoners not to go home, the right to asylum. The other, which has been cloaked in secrecy, is the right of prisoners to be free from coercion and discrimination designed to make them defect. On the first issue, Article 118 of the Geneva Convention says only "Prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities." The principle of voluntary repatriation was rejected, largely on the insistence of Britain. Since a detaining power has many means of preventing free choice, it was feared that "voluntary repatriation" might be seized on as an excuse to hold back POWs. The framers of the Convention feared a repetition of what happened after World War II when the Soviet Union held back millions of German, Italian and Japanese prisoners for years after the war was over.

Political Discrimination Forbidden

On the second issue, the right of prisoners to be free from coercion and discrimination in the camps, the Geneva Convention provided (Article 116) that all POWs must be "treated alike, without any adverse distinction based on race, nationality, religious belief or political opinion." This provision was violated when the U.S. and the South Koreans within a few months of the war's outbreak began their POW "re-education" campaign. This led to scandalous outbreaks in the camps in which many prisoners were killed. In January of 1952 prisoners who had declared for the anti-Communist side were segregated in separate camps from those who had refused to be "re-educated." In April of 1952 the allied command announced that it had finished screening the prisoners and that only 70,000 of the 170,000 wanted to go home.

Secretary of State Acheson said unctuously at the time that the right of the POWs to choose whether to return or stay was the key issue of the Korean negotiations because we upheld "the worth of the individual" while the Communists did not. The circumstances hardly lived up to the ideal of free choice. A recent study* reports that "small groups of Communist and anti-Communist activists battled physically for control of individual compounds. Whichever group achieved control was able to extend its management over most of the prisoners." In the months before the screening "the great majority of POWs were subjected to sustained, one-sided indoctrination and social pressures." Not unnaturally the side which had the camp authorities behind them, and could offer the greater inducements, won out. Is a similar process going on in the camps today and will we again learn about it only years later, and after it has played its part in delaying a settlement?

"At no time in the history of the world," Laird told Senate Foreign Relations, "has there been such a dramatic proposal" as our offer to exchange the 36,000 POWs we hold for the 3,000 he claims the other side holds. But once before in history, that of the Korean war, it turned out that we had coerced and brain-washed most of the POWs on our side into defecting. Can Nixon and Laird assure us that "re-education" has not been underway again in our POW camps? Why did Laird omit any reference to the meaning of that phrase—"the place of their choice" in Nixon's offer? Do the families of our POWs want to go through this kind of tragicomedy again before our own men are released? Do we want months more of casualties while the tangled issues are again resolved, with all the risk that the talks may break down altogether and full-scale war resume? *Dec. 14*

On Those Poor Little Unarmed Planes

SYMINGTON: Why do we constantly give the impression to the American people that all we send over there are unarmed reconnaissance planes when we have considerably more fighter planes with the unarmed reconnaissance planes and probably the same plane, the RF-4 and the F-4 [i.e. the "recon" and fighter models of the same plane].

LAIRD: I have never given that impression.

SYMINGTON: If the North Vietnamese see a group of planes come over, and the RF, the reconnaissance plane is indistinguishable to them on the ground from the fighter planes that are with them, how does the gunner on the ground know whether he should let them go over or whether he should not?

LAIRD: He does not.

—Before Senate Foreign Relations Dec. 11 (abridged)

* See Mass Behavior in Battle and Captivity: The Communist Soldier in the Korean War. **Edited by Meyers and Biderman, Univ. of Chicago Press 1968. The writers tread softly lest they step on too many toes in our military establishment but this only makes their queasy revelations the more significant.**

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy Of This Issue To A Friend If You Send Us A Long, Stamped, Self Addressed Envelope

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed special pre-publication price of $8.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, **Polemics and Prophecies: 1967-70** (Random House). Regularly $10.

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 12/28/70

4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly, 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED